

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
BEAUMONT DIVISION

STEPHEN SNIDER,

*Plaintiffs,*

VS.

ROSE MILLER, *et al.*,

*Defendants.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:24-CV-00448  
JUDGE MICHAEL J. TRUNCALE

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S SECOND MOTION FOR  
EXPEDITED DISCOVERY**

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s Second Motion for Expedited Discovery. On January 15, 2025, this Court entered an Order authorizing Plaintiff to issue subpoenas to various third parties. [Dkt. 4.]. Plaintiff now seeks authorization to issue a subpoena to Nest Services Ltd. because additional tracing has revealed target addresses controlled by Nest Services Ltd. that received approximately \$775,000 of Plaintiff’s stolen funds. Nest Services Ltd. is the entity that operates as Binance.

Many courts, including this Court, have granted plaintiffs’ motions for expedited discovery in cases like this one, where the plaintiff alleges that the defendants perpetrated a cryptocurrency-related “pig-butcher scam.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *Harris v. Upwintrade*, No. 1:24-cv-00313-MJT, Dkt. 8, at p. 9 (authorizing expedited discovery); *Cohn v. Popescu*, No. 1:24-CV-00337-MJT, Dkt. 6, at pp. 8-9 (same); *Strivelli v. Doe*, No. 22-cv-22060 2022 WL 1082638, at \*2 (D.N.J. Apr. 11, 2022) (authorizing expedited discovery from cryptocurrency exchanges in crypto case and noting “the Court’s review of

Here, as in those prior cases, the Plaintiff has shown that the discovery Plaintiff seeks to issue is narrowly tailored to the task of revealing information Plaintiff needs to effectively pursue his case against “John Doe” defendants who are alleged to have intentionally obscured their true identities and locations.

Accordingly, having reviewed Plaintiff’s Motion and supporting exhibits, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s Motion should be GRANTED. As requested in the Motion, Plaintiff is hereby authorized to issue a subpoena to Nest Services Ltd. The subpoena target shall respond to the subpoena within fourteen (14) days of the service of same, unless agreement is reached as to a longer response time.

---

cryptocurrency theft cases reveals that courts often grant motions for expedited discovery to ascertain the identity of John Doe defendants”); *Licht*, 2023 WL 4504585, at \*4 (issuing broad authorization for expedited discovery in functionally identical crypto-fraud case and requiring that “any party served with a request for production shall produce all requested items within 72 hours of the request”).

Dated: May 12, 2025

Prepared By:

THE HODA LAW FIRM, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M Hoda", enclosed within a large, loopy circular flourish.

---

Marshal J. Hoda, Esq.  
Tx. Bar No. 2411009  
12333 Sowden Road, Suite B  
PMB 51811  
Houston, TX 77080  
o. (832) 848-0036  
marshal@thehodalawfirm.com

*Attorney for Plaintiff*